



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/754,804

01/08/2004

Montgomery C. McGraw

200600385-1

1592

22879 7590 10/31/2007  
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2835

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/31/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/754,804

Applicant(s)

MCGRRAW ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony Q. Edwards

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/8/2004; 9/12/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 12-19, 24, 25, 26-36, 40-48, 53-62, 66 and 67 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2004/0176920 to Monfared et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,384,368 to Rosenfeldt et al.

The applied reference to Monfared has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal

disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Referring to claims 1, 15, 26 and 59, Monfared discloses a system for displaying chassis component information, comprising a chassis (102), a plurality of blades (104, 106, 108, 150), including at least one server blade (see paragraph 0015) coupled to the chassis, and a testing blade (150) comprising an LCD (232) positioned upon the blade (150), the LCD operable to display chassis component information. It is noted that the at least one server blade of Monfared inherently includes chassis management operable to manage switch fabric of the chassis. See Figs. 1 and 2, as well as paragraphs 0015-0020. Monfared does not teach each blade, including server blade (104), having an LCD to display chassis component information.

Rosenfeldt discloses an electronic chassis (see Fig. 1) comprising a plurality of blades (15-18) coupled to the chassis, each blade comprising a display (25) positioned upon the blade, the display operable to display chassis component information. See col. 2, lines 23-54. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to provide a display on each blade in the system of Monfared, as taught by Rosenfeldt, since this would provide a status check for each blade of the system, instead of exclusively relying on the test blade.

Referring to claims 2 and 17, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis component information comprises server

blade information of the server blade upon which the respective LCD is positioned. See col. 3, lines 3-8 of Rosenfeldt.

Referring to claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19, 27, 60 and 61, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt inherently disclose the device as claimed, since an IP (i.e., internet protocol) address, which acts as a locator for one IP device to find another IP device and interact with the same, is provided in any network system. Likewise, monitoring chassis component activity (e.g., processor speed) is also disclosed. See paragraphs 0015-0019 of Monfared.

Referring to claim 5, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the LCD being operable to display the information in color. It would well known in the art of LCD devices to utilize a variety of colors and it would have been obvious to further modify Monfared to include colors in the display, since this would help to distinguish one error or status message from another.

Referring to claims 7 and 62, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis component information comprises at least one of temperature information and voltage information. See paragraph 0023 of Monfared.

Referring to claims 12, 17, 24 and 66, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as claimed, wherein each server blade further comprises a respective management processor (206) operable to drive the respective LCD, the management processor being operationally distinct from a main processor of

the server blade such that the main processor may be inactive during operation of the respective LCD. See Fig. 2 of Monfared.

Referring to claim 13, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as claimed, wherein each server blade further comprises a respective video output operable to output the chassis component information to an external display (170), and a respective management processor (206) operable to drive the respective video output, the respective management processor operationally distinct from a respective main processor of the server blade such that the respective main processor may be inactive during output of the chassis component information to the external display. See Fig. 1 and paragraphs 0017-0018 of Monfared.

Referring to claims 14 and 67, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the LCD specifically comprising a viewing area of 14mm x 11 mm. It would have been obvious, however, to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a relatively small display with the dimensions as claimed on the bulkhead of Monfared. See Fig. 2 of Monfared.

Referring to claim 25, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis blade (108) inherently comprises a network interface card.

Referring to claims 28 and 29, Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt disclose the device as claimed, wherein the display device comprises at least one LED (230) and an LCD (232), respectively. See Fig. 2 of Monfared.

Regarding claims 30-36, 40-49 and 53-62, the method steps are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt.

Claims 8-11, 20-23, 37-39, 50-52, 63-65 and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Monfared in view of Rosenfeldt, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0084994 to Hansen. Monfared, as modified, discloses the system and corresponding method as claimed, including at least one server blade of Monfared inherently including chassis management operable to manage switch fabric of the chassis. See Figs. 1 and 2, as well as paragraphs 0015-0020. Monfared, as modified, does not teach each server blade further comprising at least one control key associated with the LCD to enable operation control of at least one chassis component.

Hansen teaches a front panel serial port user interface (28) in the form of an LCD with control keys (40) to control setup and power on an individual server blade (10). See Figs. 1-3 and paragraph 0021. It would have been obvious to further modify the system and method of Monfared to include control key(s) for operational control of at least one chassis component on the server blade, as taught by Hansen, since the device of Hansen would allow for specific control functions on each server blade individually.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards

whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:00-3:30) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash N. Gandhi can be reached on 571-272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 25, 2007  
aqe

**BORIS CHÉRVINSKY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*Boris I. Chervinsky*  
10/29/7